

Appl. No. 09/160,312
Amdt. Dated December 22, 2003
Reply to Office Action of June 27, 2003

Attorney Docket No. 5586D-6921 (81784.0185)
Customer No.: 26021

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 were pending in the Application, with claims 7-14 having been withdrawn. By this Amendment, claims 1-14, 18 and 19 are being cancelled and claims 15 and 16 are being amended to improve their form. Claims 15-17 remain in the application. No new matter is involved.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-6 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. More specifically, the recitation "functioning as a shielding wire" is said to be indefinite inasmuch as there is no established function of shielding said to be performed by a wire. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and point out, for example, that in the second paragraph on page 7 of the specification, it is described that the static electricity generated at the edges of a substrate is absorbed and shielded by a conductive section. As then further stated in lines 13 and 14 of page 7, the conductive section may preferably be formed as part of a wire arranged on the substrate. An "electric shielding wire" 10 is introduced in line 21 of page 10 of the specification, and in lines 6 and 7 of page 11 of the specification, a wire pedestal 121 is said to serve also as an "electric shielding wire 10."

Nevertheless, inasmuch as the Examiner objects to the expression "electric shielding wire" as such, Applicants are amending claim 15 so as to recite "at least a portion of one of said wires being located near the peripheral area of the substrate and outside of said plurality of driving thin film transistors to function as an electric shield for said plurality of driving thin film transistors". As so amended, claim 15 should now be clear and definite.

Claims 1-14, 18 and 19 are being cancelled. Claim 16 is being amended so that it depends from claim 15 rather than from cancelled claim 1. Claim 17 depends from claim 16.

Appl. No. 09/160,312
Amdt. Dated December 22, 2003
Reply to Office Action of June 27, 2003

Attorney Docket No. 5586D-6921 (81784.0185)
Customer No.: 26021

At the bottom of page 5 of the Office Action, claim 15 is indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 15 has been so amended, as discussed above. Therefore, claim 15 should now be allowable. Inasmuch as claim 16 depends from claim 15 and claim 17 depends from claim 16, such claims should also be allowable.

In conclusion, this Application should now be in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6846 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: December 22, 2003

By: 

John P. Scherlacher
Registration No. 23,009
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701